

| | | | |
|---|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/676,311 | GATES ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | SATISH RAMPURIA | 2191 | |

All Participants:

(1) SATISH RAMPURIA.

(2) Cory G. Claassen [Reg. No. 50,296]

Date of Interview: 5 January 2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

No

Claims discussed:

1,4,5,8,18,41,and 50

Prior art documents discussed:

No.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Examiner presented a proposed amendment to clarify the invention and to patentably distinguish from the prior art of the record. Applicants representative agreed with the suggested proposal. Please see details in the Examiner's amendment attached herewith.

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: _____

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)